

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
10

11 VICTOR EMANUEL RODRIGUEZ,

Case No.: 2:16-cv-00384-NJK

12 Plaintiff(s),

Order

13 v.

14 JAMES EDWARD PATINO, et al.,

15 Defendant(s).

16 The parties filed a joint proposed pretrial order. Docket No. 65. Since that pretrial order
17 was entered, the case has been referred to the undersigned for trial by the consent of the parties.
18 Docket No. 73. The parties shall file an amended joint proposed pretrial order as outlined below.

19 The Local Rules require that a joint proposed pretrial order must include grounds for
20 objections to exhibits and a statement whether either party intends to present evidence in electronic
21 format. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B), (9).¹ The joint proposed pretrial order purports to “reserve”
22 the right to make objections, Docket No. 65 at 4, which violates the local rules. Moreover, it
23 appears from the exhibit list that some electronic presentation of evidence is anticipated, *see, e.g.*,
24

25
26 ¹ The joint proposed pretrial order purports to afford the parties the ability to supplement
27 their exhibit list and witness list. Docket No. 65 at 3, 5. “Unless offered for impeachment
28 purposes, no exhibit will be received and no witness will be permitted to testify at trial unless listed
in the pretrial order. However, for good cause shown, the court may allow an exception to this
provision.” Local Rule 16-3(c). To the extent the parties are seeking the ability to supplement
more broadly than allowed by this local rule, such request will be denied.

1 Docket No. 65-1 at 9, but no statement to that effect has been made. An amended joint pretrial
2 order that complies with all of the requirements in Local Rule 16-3 shall be filed by June 8, 2018.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: May 8, 2018

5 
6 _____
7 Nancy J. Koppe
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28